

Message

From: Wetherington, Michele [Wetherington.Michele@epa.gov]
Sent: 9/5/2019 5:42:06 PM
To: Cooper, Jamal [cooper.jamal@epa.gov]; Gordon, Lisa Perras [Gordon.Lisa-Perras@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: GA narrative mtg..Friday morning....comment from Corey...

I didn't reply all, just to Stacey, two messages down, sorry.

Michele

From: Wetherington, Michele
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Bouma, Stacey <Bouma.Stacey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: GA narrative mtg..Friday morning....comment from Corey...

Yea. I updated our RA briefing sheet on the sharepoint site just now to say adverb, and change the court case language.

Michele

From: Bouma, Stacey <Bouma.Stacey@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 1:39 PM
To: Wetherington, Michele <Wetherington.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: GA narrative mtg..Friday morning....comment from Corey...

Thanks, not sure why he brought up the semantics. It's still modifying the word interference.

Stacey L. Bouma, Chief
Water Quality Standards Section
EPA Region 4 Water Division
(404) 562-9392

From: Wetherington, Michele <Wetherington.Michele@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 1:27 PM
To: Bouma, Stacey <Bouma.Stacey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: GA narrative mtg..Friday morning....comment from Corey...

This from Corey works for us just fine, it tells the exact same story we are telling: *which is something like "in a way that is unfair or unacceptable". That seems to tell a different story.*

An amount of interference that is unfair or unacceptable is exactly what we want to know what that means, how much is too much, because before without the word, it was only a finding of interference at all, not unacceptable amounts of interference.

Michele

From: Bouma, Stacey <Bouma.Stacey@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 10:29 AM
To: Wetherington, Michele <Wetherington.Michele@epa.gov>; Gordon, Lisa Perras <Gordon.Lisa-Perras@epa.gov>; Cooper, Jamal <cooper.jamal@epa.gov>

Cc: Able, Tony <Able.Tony@epa.gov>

Subject: GA narrative mtg..Friday morning....comment from Corey...

deliberative and pre-decisional

HQ is working to get our briefing with Sara for Friday morning (gave them the 9-9:45 timeframe). They are going to invite OGC.

I wanted to send Corey's comments just for reference. I don't think we need to change anything in the briefing sheet but just want you to be aware of his thinking (more for our preparedness if it comes up). Main hurdle, as JMG mentioned, is explaining to Sara why it is a substantive change (using meaning of the word, resulting second layer of review, change to upper boundary/not defined/kayak example).

I think our focus needs to be on our briefing (if there's time to make corrections to Corey's briefing sheet that's fine or if you can split the tasks but the priority is our briefing/briefing sheet)

I think we are in agreement that waiting for the outcome court case is not very compelling unless you start from the position that the change is non-substantive. We can probably move through that pretty quickly. I am not as solid on the other argument in there about definitions and surplusage cannon. First, unreasonably is not an adjective but it is an adverb, and any follow up definition if you point to one should probably point to the adverb's definition, which is something like "in a way that is unfair or unacceptable". That seems to tell a different story. And citing a cannon of statutory interpretation often invites citations to alternative cannons, while it is hard to persuade policy people here with such a formalistic argument.

But, of course, you all are welcome to make it.

Stacey L. Bouma, Chief
Water Quality Standards Section
EPA Region 4 Water Division
(404) 562-9392